Fiat Juſtitia, & Ruat Cœlum.

Or, Somewhat offer'd in Defence of the

Imperial Crown of England,

And its SUCCESSOR.

In Anſwer to a SPEECH, pretended to be ſpoken in the Honourable Houſe of Commons, upon Reading the BILL againſt the D.

By a true Engliſhman.

IT is not long ago, ſince a mighty Orator, Lawyer, Logician, and what not, moſt ſtrenuouſly undertook, for weighty Conſiderations, to overthrow all Law and Logick, and by tacking of inconſequent words (as he us'd to do Bills) together, to ſhew the World how zealouſly and boldly he could ſpeak No ſence. This ſame Sir *Formal Trifle*, who in his *Exordium* very gravely tells his Auditory, there is a neceſſity of ſpeaking their minds in a Grand Affair, that concerns the King and Kingdom, would fain make them believe, that he is a going to ſay ſomewhat for the King, (as he expreſſes it) and ſo to prove himſelf an extraordinary Loyaliſt, makes a Speech for the King, in oppoſition to the Royal Will. He knows very well, the King has often declar'd, That he would never do any thing that might hinder the Succeſſion to the Crown in the right Line; yet ſtill he muſt try his faculty in Rhetorick, and ſay ſomewhat for the King. Now either this kind Gentleman imagines, he can be a greater Friend to the King, than the King to himſelf, or elſe his Wit and Eloquence have ſpoil'd his Memory in the Law; for there he may find, the King is no *Minor*, but that he has always years enough to ſpeak for himſelf. But 'tis no matter what he means; let it be what it will, he muſt needs be a good States-man, that utters himſelf, like a Spout, for the King and Kingdom; eſpecially in a buſineſs of ſuch importance, as the ſecuring of Religion. And indeed this Theologico-Political Orator of ours, takes the true way to ſecure Religion; for he will not let any body enjoy ſo much as his Birth-right, if it be poſſible, that ſuch a thing may be dangerous to Religion. Now truly here we may take occaſion to conſider in this weighty Matter, what manner of Religion this good Gentleman would ſecure: Is it the Creed of *Knipperdolling?* truly I am not certain, he does not mean ſo. Is it the truly modern Inſtitutions of *Geneveſian John?* it may be ſo either, for ought I know; but that it is not the Proteſtant Religion of the Church of *England*, I dare boldly, and with the higheſt zeal affirm. I cannot tell what he ſuppoſes, or what the Spirit within him dictates; but, if his Policy have not o'recome his Religion, he muſt confeſs, that neither the avow'd Doctrine of this Church, nor any juſt and rational Interpretation of Scripture, can induce him to think, that Religion is to be ſecur'd by perverting the univerſal principle of all Nations, and acting contrary to the expreſs Word of God. But indeed ſo zealous is this paſſionate Advocate for his Religion, *i. e.* his Eſtate, (for ſo he afterwards explains himſelf) that to ſecure his own Right, he will not be diſcouraged by the ſeeming oppoſition of any, that another has; no, though his own King's Succeſſor, whoſe Orator he has lately made himſelf. 987953

My Lord Chancellor, he tells us, lately told them, that *This was the Time*; and he very wiſely thinks, that he may make uſe of this Saying upon all occurrences, like *Teage* in the *Committee*, ſo he has but a Letter, he cares not who it's written to. And then beſides that, he preſumes to be as good a Politician as my Lord, (how arrogantly, the World may judge) and to apply thoſe words (which his Lordſhip maturely brought forth) to the crude Notions of his own raw Brains; he goes on and comments upon what my Lord ſaid, and makes his Lordſhip's Time (long enough for deliberation, and profound Thoughts) to ſhrink and dwindle into an inconſiderable, inconſiderate Moment. But truly a Moment is of a duration ſufficient to ſpeak all his Reaſon in, and if diviſible, would lie at leaſt one half upon our hands, ready to be imploy'd in any other kind of Jargon. And now he has found the Critical Minute of action, he as judiciouſly adviſes not to let it ſlip, but with a diſpatch as quick as Thought, immediately reſolve upon his Counſel: For if you do not, you are under a great hazard, that your Children may curſe you, nay, be bound to curſe you, that's more. A ſtrange obligation this upon Children, that they ſhould be bound to curſe their Forefathers for doing Juſtice even to an Heathen: For ſurely this Gentleman's Children (eſpecially if they are not truly his) may eaſily come to know, that Right and Wrong were never reſtrain'd to this or that ſort of men, but common and diffus'd to all Mankind. No, they'l certainly conſider, that there's no-

Fiat Juſtitia, & Ruat Cœlum.

Or, Somewhat offer'd in Defence of the

Imperial Crown of England,

And its SUCCESSOR.

In Anſwer to a SPEECH, pretended to be ſpoken in the Honourable Houſe of Commons, upon Reading the BILL againſt the D.

By a true Engliſhman.

IT is not long ago, ſince a mighty Orator, Lawyer, Logician, and what not, moſt ſtrenuouſly undertook, for weighty Conſiderations, to overthrow all Law and Logick, and by tacking of inconſequent words (as he us'd to do Bills) together, to ſhew the World how zealouſly and boldly he could ſpeak Nonſence. This ſame Sir *Formal Trifle*, who in his *Exordium* very gravely tells his Auditory, there is a neceſſity of ſpeaking their minds in a Grand Affair, that concerns the King and Kingdom, would fain make them believe, that he is a going to ſay ſomewhat for the King, (as he expreſſes it) and ſo to prove himſelf an extraordinary Loyaliſt, makes a Speech for the King, in oppoſition to the Royal Will. He knows very well, the King has often declar'd, That he would never do any thing that might hinder the Succeſſion to the Crown in the right Line; yet ſtill he muſt try his faculty in Rhetorick, and ſay ſomewhat for the King. Now either this kind Gentleman imagines, he can be a greater Friend to the King, than the King to himſelf, or elſe his Wit and Eloquence have ſpoil'd his Memory in the Law; for there he may find, the King is no *Minor*, but that he has always years enough to ſpeak for himſelf. But 'tis no matter what he means; let it be what it will, he muſt needs be a good States-man, that utters himſelf, like a Spout, for the King and Kingdom; eſpecially in a buſineſs of ſuch importance, as the ſecuring of Religion. And indeed this Theologico-Political Orator of ours, takes the true way to ſecure Religion; for he will not let any body enjoy ſo much as his Birth-right, if it be poſſible, that ſuch a thing may be dangerous to Religion. Now truly here we may take occaſion to conſider in this weighty Matter, what manner of Religion this good Gentleman would ſecure: Is it the Creed of *Knipperdolling?* truly I am not certain, he does not mean ſo. Is it the truly modern Inſtitutions of *Geneveſian John?* it may be ſo either, for ought I know; but that it is not the Proteſtant Religion of the Church of *England*, I dare boldly, and with the higheſt zeal affirm. I cannot tell what he ſuppoſes, or what the Spirit within him dictates; but, if his Policy have not o'recome his Religion, he muſt confeſs, that neither the avow'd Doctrine of this Church, nor any juſt and rational Interpretation of Scripture, can induce him to think, that Religion is to be ſecur'd by perverting the univerſal principle of all Nations, and acting contrary to the expreſs Word of God. But indeed ſo zealous is this paſſionate Advocate for his Religion, *i. e.* his Eſtate, (for ſo he afterwards explains himſelf) that to ſecure his own Right, he will not be diſcouraged by the ſeeming oppoſition of any, that another has; no, though his own King's Succeſſor, whoſe Orator he has lately made himſelf.

My Lord Chancellor, he tells us, lately told them, that *This was the Time*; and he very wiſely thinks, that he may make uſe of this Saying upon all occurrences, like *Teage* in the *Committee*, ſo he has but a Letter, he cares not who it's written to. And then beſides that, he preſumes to be as good a Politician as my Lord, (how arrogantly, the World may judge) and to apply thoſe words (which his Lordſhip maturely brought forth) to the crude Notions of his own raw Brains; he goes on and comments upon what my Lord ſaid, and makes his Lordſhip's Time (long enough for deliberation, and profound Thoughts) to ſhrink and dwindle into an inconſiderable, inconſiderate Moment. But truly a Moment is of a duration ſufficient to ſpeak all his Reaſon in, and if diviſible, would lie at leaſt one half upon our hands, ready to be imploy'd in any other kind of Jargon. And now he has found the Critical Minute of action, he as judiciouſly adviſes not to let it ſlip, but with a diſpatch as quick as Thought, immediately reſolve upon his Counſel: For if you do not, you are under a great hazard, that your Children may curſe you, nay, be bound to curſe you, that's more. A ſtrange obligation this upon Children, that they ſhould be bound to curſe their Forefathers for doing Juſtice even to an Heathen: For ſurely this Gentleman's Children (eſpecially if they are not truly his) may eaſily come to know, that Right and Wrong were never reſtrain'd to this or that ſort of men, but common and diffus'd to all Mankind. No, they'l certainly conſider, that there's no

reason they should curse their Fathers, for not making a Law to dis-inherit an Heir; for it will be naturally suggested to them, that it might have been their own case. Oh! but the *great good* that follows upon this however unnatural Injury, is no less, than the securing of Religion. So then, we may *do ill, that good may come on't*. I protest, but that this Gentleman is a Member of the Honourable House, I should have taken him for a Jesuit, that had onely disguis'd himself under a pretence for Protestant Religion. For I appeal to the whole House, if this be not a Jesuitical practice, to cut off a King, or (which is worse) dethrone him, and yet more barbarously let him live, meerly because he is an Heretick to their Principles. He that relies upon such Maximes, makes it utterly impossible ever to establish any, much less the *Protestant* Religion. I admire what wonders this worthy Patriot thinks the *D.* can do when he comes to the Crown; can he make Laws, or alter the Constitution of the Government, without the consent of a Parliament? He does not think so, I am sure. Why then certainly, he must believe the whole Nation is inclined to Popery, or otherwise he could never imagine a Popish Successor to be so formidable a Gyant as he makes him. But let him live where he will, in the City or Countrey, I don't doubt but he hears arguments enough, to perswade any reasonable Creature, that 'tis a difficulty to bring Popery into *England*, next to that of translating *Rome* to *London*. Can he think, that the King's being a Papist will be a just reason why the People must be so too? when so many and the same Laws continue in force against that kind of men? If we for fear of the Tyranny of the See of *Rome* stealing upon us, would take way the Kings Succession, what kind of Elective Monarchy would this be, that for so many Ages has ran down in a continu'd stream of Inheritable Blood, without any interruption? At that rate, when ever the Speech-makers in the House of Commons could make the rest fear any remote possibility of danger from the King's Successors perswasion (be it what it would be) the Crown must be straight-way settled upon some other (Christian or no Christian, all's one, so no Papist) and so the right Heir be dis-inherited, for not serving the People with more reverence than his Maker. There's no man but would willingly enjoy the freedom of his Religion, and would hardly think it just to have his Estate taken from him for it; how then can any one say, 'Tis fit that the Descent of a Crown should be impeded for an opinion which was precedently taken up. If it were such a crime to be of this or that Opinion, so high, as to make a man liable to be dis-inherited, how could any one be sure of what he has? For be it once granted, that the *D.* may be cut off from his Inheritance for his present Perswasion, then the reason will be equally urgent against any other as him. For whosoever comes to the Crown with a new or an old Religion, is as obnoxious to this Exception as a *Romanist*. The onely objection against the *D.* that can possibly be made, is, that he would endeavour to propagate his Perswasion; who would not? who does not? This very Orator would, and does most vehemently press the House to believe what he says, and dares do't, nay, thinks he's bound in Conscience to do it, *i.e.* to settle his Religion by such means as none would do, but such a Person as is acted by Zeal and Interest, mix'd with some Vanity and Popularity. The Argument would return too smartly upon him, if we should say, Therefore a Presbyterian may lose his Right, because of his being so. But besides the want of Reason, I find a great scarcity of common sense in what this Politician says, *It will be utterly impossible to secure the Protestant Religion under a Popish Successor, unless you totally disable him to inherit*, &c. How is he *Popish Successor*, under whom, &c. if he be *totally disabled* to inherit? And then the connection of what follows is so natural, — *unless you disable him to inherit*, — *and the Tyranny of the See of* Rome *will infallibly steal upon us*. I confess I cannot tell when, no more than he can: For I must tell him boldly, that if he means under a Popish Successor, it is nonsense upon non-sense: For first he says, *A Successor under whom*, &c. *should be utterly disabled to inherit*, &c. and then after that, *The Tyranny will steal upon us infallibly*, because the Man from whom we ought to fear is totally disabled to inherit. But whether it hang together or no, 'tis all one, it sounds well enough, and looks like an happy Thought for our security: And who can blame a man for an incoherence, as long as he loves his Countrey: It may be he was in a Rapture, or a fit of the highest Zeal; and then one may be allowed to forget himself, having so great a respect to the Protestant Religion.

The next consideration in this weighty matter is, that a King is not restrainable by Penal Laws, but, like *Samson*, can break through them; and therefore we must clip his Locks, that is, take his Crown or his Head from him, if we can possibly surmise that he would pull down the Temple. Truly this Gentleman would have made a better *Philistin* than a Protestant. Oh! but how can one blame him for his zealous fear, when he has lately seen *Coleman*'s Ghost, dreadfully reciting a terrible Maxim, That the Papists would get the upper hand, if they stood upon an equal foot; and if so, (and so it must needs be, if Mr. *Coleman*'s infallible Spirit said it) why then, to secure our own Lives and Estates, make sure of the *Duke*'s, let him not have his Right, if ours may be indangered by suffering him to have his. This is a Maxim of ours (Mr. *Coleman*) and so there's a *Rowland* for your *Oliver*. I say, this is true Religion, besides the Policy of it. For look you, Religion teaches to secure Religion, and I my self have found out a way to effect it. The invention indeed is very new, but 'tis the better for that, and the more [illegible] and though it seem a little odd at first, yet if a man do but consider, that Religion is

concern'd, why then he may eaſily imagine, that Religion can be againſt nothing that is done in favour of Religion. There 'tis then. We to prevent Maſſacres may do worſe; that is, calmly and adviſedly, by the Sanction of Law, take away a Prince's Inheritance, leſt in his Reign there ſhould happen a Riot, or an Hurly-burly among the People. Is it reaſonable, that any King ſhould Rule us, that will not promiſe to make *Weſtminſter-Hall* of no uſe, or ſwear at his Coronation, that no Popiſh Prieſt or Laick ſhall ever moleſt, trouble, or annoy any of the King's Liege People with any Diſputes or Controverſies in or about Religion; or that any Jeſuit, in any diſguiſe whatſoever, ſhall ever ſet foot upon his Majeſty's Land of *Great Britain*? For, Sir, I muſt tell you, unleſs it were ſo, I know no cauſe why we may not chooſe another man that can and will do ſo. Poor man! how pale he looks at the apparition of *Coleman's* Maxim? Truly though he pretends zeal for the Proteſtant Religion yet me-thinks this argues him to have but a very mean opinion of it; and I ſuſpect him for a Jeſuit now more than before, becauſe he believes ſo ſtedfaſtly in *Coleman's* Maxim. Surely he could not give any great credit to *Coleman*, if he had thoſe honourable thoughts which he pretends of the Proteſtant Religion, nor ever think the ruine of it ſo feaſible, if he were ſo zealous for the ſecuring of it. And now he a ſecond time brings my Lord Chancellor before us, and by pretty alluſions would make his Lordſhip's Speech as inſignificant as that of himſelf. Now 'tis a *Fig-leaſe*, and in the ſame breath, *Leaf-gold*, and to both theſe he allows ſome uſe and flattering Ornament, (more than my Lord can do for his Speech.) But he has a third Metaphor, which does my Lord a great deal of honour before he's aware on't; 'Tis like a *Mother* that has a froward Child, he ſays. And truly I am much of his mind; for 'tis indeed *as froward* and humorſome a Brat as e'er poor Mother had; it wou'd have ſo many Toys and Jim-cracks, that ſhe cannot poſſibly pleaſe it. Indeed the peeviſh Chit ſcarce knows what to ask, or at leaſt is uſed to make his demands after ſuch a manner, that 'tis impoſſible the good Gentlewoman ſhould anſwer his deſire, but with ſome diſparagement to Maternal Dignity. Yet ſtill there is a neceſſity that his Requeſts muſt be ſatisfied, let them be what they will, juſt or unjuſt, againſt Nature or otherwiſe, all's one, Child muſt be pleaſed: And ſo the neceſſity of the Bill is Mathematically demonſtrated. But that is not all, unleſs you can demonſtrate the good that may accrue by it, (for there is a difference between the Bill and its Goodneſs) and ſo conſequently make the World your Proſelytes. Now to perform this mighty task, thus I begin.

Firſt, I grant, that there is a *great evil* that will enſue upon it, but not *half* ſo great as the *good* that may *come by it*: and therefore as long as 'tis no otherwiſe, it will be allowed by the whole Nation, and they'll eaſily forget a trifling ill (of taking the Sight of a private Prince from him or ſo) when they ſee it is a ſo far greater good that is conſequent thereupon. And that it is ſo, is very plain; for we ſhall *ſecure our Eſtates*, and that by onely taking away the Duke's, *i.e.* killing him; for to take away his Eſtate (according to this Gentleman) is to kill him, and worſe, admitting that he is an *Engliſh-man*. But it may be this Demonſtrator fancies him no *Engliſh-man*, ſince he went into *Flanders*, but that he has alter'd his Nature with his Religion. Truly that would be an excellent Demonſtration, if he could make it. But I find he is a very young Demonſtrator; for, if you obſerve, his Demonſtration goes off in a bare opinion, and does not at all compel our aſſent. But if he cannot demonſtrate ſo well, yet he can put Caſes, like *Littleton*. Thus, if the King be a *Lunatick* (in an Elective Monarchy) and cannot do the Kingdom any good, the Subjects may chooſe another as in the caſe of *Portugal*) therefore by parity of reaſon, if a King's Heir be ſo mad as to be of any Perſwaſion different from the People, (in an Hereditary Government, as in *England*) the People may chooſe another Heir to ſerve the Kingdom; for that is the main reaſon why he muſt be turn'd out, to wit, becauſe he cannot *ſerve the Nation*. A very fine expreſſion for one that ſpeaks for the King, and like a Lawyer too. Now as to the point of Law, it ſeems very ſtrange, that it ſhould be Rebellion to riſe up againſt the King, and yet no offence to *diſ-inherit him*. It was indeed Enacted in the 13*th*. of the Queen, That whoſoever ſhould affirm, that the Laws and Statutes did not bind the Right of the Crown, and the Deſcent, Limitation, Inheritance, or Governance thereof, ſhould be guilty of High Treaſon; and not onely of a *Præmunire*, as this Rhetorical Lawyer, in his merciful Ignorance, leſſens the guilt. But the Act is expired, and no other ſince made that I hear of; if there were, I know of no man that would be ſo ſottiſhly mad as to offend againſt it; for it is not the queſtion now, whether the King and Parliament can politically, but whether they can Morally do what this Gentleman propoſes, without any violence to Juſtice and Religion. The 35*th*. of *H*. 8. limits the Crown to *Edward*, *Mary*, *Elizabeth*, and their Lawful Heirs, becauſe they were of Inheritable Blood; and for lack of ſuch Iſſue, that then the King *H*. 8. might diſpoſe of it by Will, or Letters Patents, for the avoiding (I humbly conceive) of ſtriſe that might ariſe, among thoſe that ſhould afterwards pretend any Right; but it was never deſigned by him or any other, that a Lawful Heir ſhould be excluded from ſucceeding, nor is there any reaſon in it, let who will go about to *demonſtrate*, *opine*, or *ſay it*. That Heathen, I am ſure, would have made a better Chriſtian, as he was a better Lawyer than our Orator, who more agreeably to the intent of all Laws, ſaid, *Fiat juſtitia, & ruat Cœlum*.

A *SPEECH* in the House of *COMMONS*, Upon Reading the *Bill* against the D.

WE have now the weightiest matter under our Consideration, that ever came before us, therefore we ought with the highest Zeal to speak our minds boldly for the King and Kingdom: for as the matter is of no less importance, than to secure our Religion to Posterity, so much the rather should we apply our selves to manifest that we will not be discouraged by any seeming opposition whatsoever.

But as the Lord Chancellor lately told us, This is the Time, so I must repeat it, That it is indeed the Time; that is to say, the Moment: which if we should suffer to slip from us, it may never be in our power to regain, and then our Children may be bound to Curse us: for I must tell you, That it will be utterly impossible ever to secure the Protestant Religion under a Popish Successor, unless you do totally disable him to inherit these Protestant Countries; and the Tyranny of the See of Rome will infallibly steal upon us.

For to think to restrain a King under the power of a Penal Law, thereby to secure Religion, is no more than to bind Sampson with Cords, who as soon as 'tis said, The Philistins are upon thee, will break them all in pieces, and carry the Gates away with him, and leave you open to the invasion of the Enemy; nothing therefore can be able to secure us, but to clip his Locks: For if the Papists do at this time design to subvert our Religion under a Protestant Prince, how much more will they design against us under a Popish Successor? What will not the Priests and Jesuits undertake, to procure our Destruction, when they shall have the favour of the Prince, and are secured that the Laws and Statutes made against them, shall not be put in Execution? for 'tis Coleman's Maxim, That if the Popish Religion stood upon an equal foot with the Protestant, the Popish Religion would get the better, as they would manage it; and then our Estates could never be secure, no, nor our very Lives; and Protestants would be discouraged, and hardly dare to speak their minds; and Massacres may be as frequent and as great here, as they were formerly at Paris: So that 'tis clear we can never restrain him.

The Lord Chancellor in his Speech tells you, That when His Majesty shall happen to dye, we shall have a convenient time to settle Religion and the Nation. Let me ask you, Must we act with the Successor, or without him? if we act with him, he will never consent to any thing we shall do against him; if without him, we act as a Commonwealth, and that he will never suffer, but perhaps, will send his Guards, and turn us out of Doors, and what will become of us then?

One Reason laid down to us likewise is, That it is impossible for a Successor to raise Money, but by Consent of Parliament: that point may be easily answered by us, There are many small Burroughs and Towns who chose us, where there are but few Voices; how easie is it to purchase those Votes by Money? if he should lay out Ten or Twenty thousand pound for the purchase, they would soon give it him again; and then the whole Nation will be ruin'd without Redemption. The Speech of the Lord Chancellor is only a Fig-leaf to cover our Nakedness, or rather Leaf-Gold to flatter us; or like a Mother who having a froward Child, and upon necessity must do something to pacifie it, she gives it any thing she hath, but lets it kéep it no longer than she pleases.

Now I have shewn you the necessity of this Bill, let us next consider, that the good which will come by it, is far greater than the evil that can ensue upon it; which I will thus demonstrate: If we give way to a Popish Successor, we give away Religion, and have Popish Tyranny for a recompence; And then consequently, our Estates will be taken away, and for an English man to lose his Estate, is worse than to lose his Life, since he must continue in perpetual Bondage, and be worse than a Captive slave, and shall be Priest-ridden every day; therefore in my opinion, it is far better for us to resolve to maintain our Religion, and to secure our selves by opposing any violence that shall be offered to us from abroad, than to be in danger of having our Throats cut every moment, by those that shall be amongst us.

Now let us consider, whether this may be effected by Law, or out of necessity. I will put the Case, That if a Prince be born to a Kingdom who is either Lunatick, or otherwise disabled to do the Kingdom any good, shall not the Subjects in this Case proceed to chose another who may preserve the Kingdom, when otherwise it must of necessity perish? as lately in the Case of Portugal, they chose another to succeed, because of the disability of the former; And shall not we then disable the Duke, who cannot possibly do the Nation any service, his Principles being so contrary and destructive to the Laws, Statutes and Constitutions of this Government, as nothing but ruine can ensue thereby?

Now as to the Point of Law, I must say, that as for a private person to rise against his Prince, is Rebellion; so on the contrary, when there is an Act of Parliament to disable him, and that upon such good grounds and reasons as we have heard read against him this day, we shall be justified by all the World in opposing his Claim; and we have had Presidents of this kind heretofore. And it was enacted in Queen Elizabeths time, That those who durst any way dispute that the King and Parliament could not appoint a Successor, should be guilty of a Præmunire.

FINIS.